REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12 and 14-15 are presently active, Claims 3, 8 and 13 having been previously canceled without prejudice, and Claims 1, 6 and 11 having been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12 and 14-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Silva et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,976,210).

Regarding the rejection of Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-12 and 14-15, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome because, in Applicants' view, amended independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 patentably distinguish over the applied references as discussed below.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "converting semantically the document structure generated by the inserting step into a desired document structure according to ranges of the second document to be converted including the partial documents inserted by the inserting step and identification information of a file describing a conversion rule for converting the document structure into the desired document structure". Thus, this converting step changes semantics of the document structure containing the original document structures of the first document and the second document (for example, Specification, page 12, lines 17-19, and page 38, line 28 through page 40, line 7).

In this regard, the outstanding Office Action states that Silva et al. discloses that the parser can correct, or convert, the tag structure into the desired structure in col. 7 lines 47-52. However, Silva et al. describes "Note that since many HTML pages are not well-formed, there may be missing tags, tags for different elements may overlap, etc., the parser must correct such page anomalies. Thus parser 210 generates an equivalent well-formed version of

the source Web page from which a clipping is to be extracted." (column 7, lines 47-52)

Namely, Silva et al. focuses on generating an equivalent well-formed version of a source

Web page from which a clipping is to be extracted. The term "well-formed" means that

elements, delimited by start-tag and end-tag, nest properly within each other in a document

containing the elements (http://www.w3.org/TR/REC-xml/#dt-wellformed). If the source

Web page is not well-formed, a parser 210 corrects such page anomalies so that elements nest

properly within each other in the source Web page. This conversion standardizes ambiguous

grammar of the document structure containing the original document structures of the source

Web page from which clippings are to be extracted. However, semantics before this

conversion is identical to semantics after this conversion. Thus, Silva et al. fails to teach or

suggest "converting *semantically* the document structure generated by the inserting step into

a desired document structure according to ranges of the second document to be converted

including the partial documents inserted by the inserting step and identification information

of a file describing a conversion rule for converting the document structure into the desired

document structure" recited in Claim 1.

Similarly, Silva et al. fails to teach or suggest "a conversion unit configured to convert

semantically the document structure generated by the insertion unit into a desired document

structure according to ranges of the second document to be converted including the partial

documents inserted by the insertion unit and identification information of a file describing a

conversion rule for converting the document structure into the desired document structure"

recited in Claim 6.

Similarly, Silva et al. fails to teach or suggest "third computer program codes for

causing the computer to convert semantically the document structure generated by the second

computer program codes into a desired document structure according to ranges of the second

document to be converted including the partial documents inserted by the second computer

program codes and identification information of a file describing a conversion rule for

converting the document structure into the desired document structure" recited in Claim 11.

Accordingly, independent Claims 1, 6 and 11 patentably distinguish over <u>Silva et al.</u>

Therefore, Claims 1, 6 and 11 and the pending Claims 2, 4-5, 7, 9-10, 12 and 14-15

dependent from Claims 1, 6, and 11 are believed to be allowable.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above

discussions, it is believed that the outstanding rejection has been overcome, and the

application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An

early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

EHK\TY:msh
I:\ATTY\TY\AMEND-RESPONSES\217398\217398 Am DUE APRIL 5 2006.DOC